IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.RAMKUMAR

FRIDAY, THE 7TH DECEMBER 2007 / 16TH AGRAHAYANA 1929

Crl.Rev.Pet.No. 4388 of 2007()

CRA.351/2006 of ADDL. DISTRICT & SESSIONS COURT (ADHOC-I), THODUPUZHA
CC.211/2005 of CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE COURT, THODUPUZHA

.....

REVN. PETITIONER: REVISION PETITIONER/APPELLANT/ACCUSED:

S. PALANIYAPPAN,
PROPRIETOR, UNIVERSAL LEATHER, DOOR NO.4/9,
D.R. APPARTMENT, KANDARESWAMI CHETTY STREET,
ERODE-3, TAMIL NADU.

BY ADV. SRI.P.K.RAVINDRAN
SRI.P.GOPINATH MENON

RESPONDENTS: RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT & STATE:

1. THE KAIRALI LEATHER INDUSTRIES,
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING PARTNER,SRI.M.J.JOSEPH
KAIRALI LEATHER INDUSTRIES, EDAYAR, ALUVA,
ERNAKULAM.

2. STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT OF KERALA, ERNAKULAM.

BY ADV. SRI. P. RAVEENDRA BABU, PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

THIS CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 07/12/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

V.RAMKUMAR, J.

==========

Crl.R.P. No. 4388 of 2007

==========

Dated this the 7th day of December, 2007

O R D E R

In this Revision filed under Section 397 read with Sec. 401 Cr.P.C. the petitioner who was the accused in C.C. No. 211 of 2005 on the file of the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Thodupuzha challenges the conviction entered and the sentence passed against him for an offence punishable under Sec. 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act').

2. I heard the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner and the learned Public Prosecutor.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the Revision Petitioner re-iterated the contentions in support of the Revision. The courts below have concurrently held that the cheque in question was drawn by the petitioner in favour of the complainant on the drawee bank, that the cheque was validly presented to the bank, that it was dishonoured for reasons which fall under Section 138 of the Act, that the complainant made a demand for payment by a notice in time in accordance with clause (b) of the proviso to Section 138 of the Act and that the Revision Petitioner/accused failed to make the payment within 15 days of receipt of the statutory notice. Both the courts have considered and rejected the defence set up by the revision petitioner while entering the above finding. The said finding has been recorded on an appreciation of the oral and documentary

evidence. I do not find any error, illegality or impropriety in the finding so recorded concurrently by the courts below. The conviction was thus rightly entered against the petitioner.

4. What now survives for consideration is the question as to whether a proper sentence has been imposed on the Revision Petitioner. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, I am, however, inclined to modify the sentence in the light of the recent pronouncement by the Supreme Court that no default sentence can be imposed for an order for compensation under Section 357(3) Cr.P.C. The sentence imposed on the revision petitioner is set aside and instead he is sentenced to pay fine of Rs.1,07,300/-(Rupees one lakh seven thousand and three hundred only) which shall be deposited within six months from today and on default to make the payment, he shall suffer simple imprisonment for three months. The fine amount shall be paid as compensation under Section 357(1) Cr.P.C.

This Revision is disposed of confirming the conviction but modifying the sentence as above.

V. RAMKUMAR, JUDGE.

rv